

used it as a party tactic as it has never been used in our Nation's history. And, once again, the question is: Will the politics of obstruction prevail? Will those who are against letting the Senate work its will prevail? Or will we finally act to break the stranglehold of money on the American political system?

I urge my colleagues to vote to end this filibuster. Let us have a vote. If you do not want to vote for it, do not vote for it. And, once enacted, if you do not want to participate in the system, do not participate. But let those who want a cleaner, better system have their chance to participate in it.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Mitchell-Ford-Boren amendment No. 366 to S. 3, the Congressional Spending Limit and Election Reform Act:

David L. Boren, Carl Levin, Wendell Ford, Dale Bumpers, Thomas Daschle, Howard Metzenbaum, Jeff Bingaman, Tom Harkin, John P. Kerry, Joseph Lieberman, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Herb Kohl, Harris Wofford, David Pryor, Paul Simon, Max Baucus.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Mitchell-Ford-Boren amendment No. 366 to S. 3, the Congressional Spending Limit and Election Reform Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUTENBERG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 41, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 146 Leg.)

YEAS—53

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Mitchell
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boren	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Heflin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Breaux	Inouye	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Riegle
Byrd	Kerry	Robb
Campbell	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Krueger	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sasser
DeConcini	Leahy	Simon
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wofford
Feingold	Mathews	

NAYS—41

Bennett	Eaton	McCaig
Bond	Faircloth	McConnell
Brown	Gorton	Nickles
Burns	Gramm	Packwood
Chafee	Grassley	Presler
Coats	Gregg	Roth
Cochran	Hatch	Shelby
Cohen	Helms	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kamphorn	Stevens
Danforth	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wallop
Durenberger	Mack	

NOT VOTING—6

Domenici	Kerrey	Murkowski
Hatfield	Metzenbaum	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 41. Three-fifths of the Senators, duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. DECONCINI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, does the Senator from Vermont wish to speak? I will yield to him without losing my right to the floor. How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I need only 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Vermont for not more than 2 minutes under the unanimous consent that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

THE CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I must say I was surprised that a cloture petition was filed yesterday afternoon. I am more surprised and dismayed to hear the majority leader try and blame this side of the aisle. There are many of us here dedicated to bringing forth good constructive reform.

Oddly enough, the filing came in the midst of conversation between Senators and staff on our side and some of the proponents of this legislation. I think we have had a productive dialog between those of us who could support campaign finance reform and the leaders on the other side of the aisle.

By no means have we come to any agreement, but I think the potential for one continues to exist. Given the good-faith effort on our side, I do not understand this effort to cut off debate.

If the majority thinks there is no possibility for compromise, fine, let us get on with it. But I am getting mixed signals. On the one hand I hear an interest in trying to reach agreement, on the other that we are engaging in a filibuster.

I am not taking part in any filibuster. I think the amendments we have seen have been thoughtful and germane. Until today, I do not think we have spent much time at all in quorum calls. Much, if not most of the time, has been spent on amendments from the Democratic side.

But what about today? Well, I can only speak for myself, but I have been waiting all day to get reactions from the majority to some amendments I have submitted. I was ready to go this afternoon, indeed have made it clear I want to offer my amendments. I did not because the managers asked me not to.

That is a perfectly fair request. Many Members and their staff are busy with the reconciliation bill, a bill driven by a very tight timeframe, that obviously must be a higher priority than this legislation.

And now, just before I came over to vote, my staff told me that one of my amendments should be acceptable with modification, with the others open for further discussion.

I do not get it. I understand the delay. But if the delay is coming from the Democratic side, where Senators are tied up with reconciliation, do not then charge that Republicans are blocking campaign finance reform. Or is it because a constructive bill removing barriers to challengers may pass.

Mr. President, I must say I am a little disturbed by this vote. It is premature in my view. As my colleagues on the other side know full well, it will fail. A number of the issues raised by me and my colleagues have yet to be debated and disposed of one way or another. Every one in this Chamber knows that until that happens, there is not apt to be a single Republican vote for cloture.

If the point of this vote is to score partisan political points, then perhaps

it makes sense. If the point is to advance campaign finance reform, it makes no sense.

I will vote against cloture and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent order the Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I want to join my colleague from Vermont. I must say I take exception to the notion that we are part of a small band of willful Republicans who have nothing but self-interest at stake and do not want to reflect the will of the American people. I firmly believe that were the American people given an opportunity to strike out the provisions of public funding in this measure that they would vote overwhelmingly to do so. But apparently that was not going to be allowed today, or tomorrow, or Monday, or Tuesday.

Senator DOLE has an amendment that he would like to offer. I have one.

This is not a filibuster being conducted by a group of willful public servants who want nothing but to frustrate the will of the American people. I resent that characterization. I have been working in good faith with many of my colleagues to see if we could not improve this legislation. Senator DURENBERGER has one very constructive proposal, and I hope he will be given an opportunity to present it.

So the notion that somehow this is a filibuster, I think, is erroneous. Filing cloture petitions to cut off a debate, thereby classifying this as a filibuster, I think is wrong. Not only is it premature, but it wrongly characterizes the nature of the debate here.

I hope we will be given an opportunity to offer amendments in a constructive fashion and, hopefully, we can improve this legislation. But if we are not given the opportunity, I fully intend to oppose any cloture petitions in the future.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding. I have more to say, but in 2 minutes I cannot begin to express the kind of resentment I feel about being characterized as "a band of willful Republicans" trying to frustrate the will of the American people.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the Senator will yield, I would like to ask if I could get agreement from our colleagues on that side of the aisle to have a vote on final passage of this bill next Wednesday.

Mr. DOLE. All amendments will be offered?

Mr. MITCHELL. I made this offer 2 nights ago: Give us a list of amendments, and if we can have a date certain for final passage, we will be pleased to do that. We offered it Thurs-

day night; the answer was no. We offered it Friday; no answer. We offered it Monday; no answer. We offered it Tuesday; no answer. If that is not a filibuster, I do not know what is.

I am asking this: Can we get an agreement from our Republican colleagues to have a vote on final passage on this bill next Wednesday?

Mr. DOLE. Let us think about it.

Mr. COHEN. Can we vote on—

Mr. MITCHELL. Or next Thursday?

Mr. COHEN. Can we vote on Senator SHELBY's amendment this evening?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes. We are willing to stay and work. As far as this Senator is concerned, I would be delighted. I will vote the other way on cloture if we can have votes on all of these amendments. Let us stay tonight and work and get this done.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have been on this bill for 2 weeks. I have accommodated a large number of Senators, including Republican Senators, on not having votes for substantial periods of time, including 2 hours today to accommodate the schedule of a Republican Senator.

We have already announced that it is the last vote today, and the Senator knows that some Senators have left town; and I am not going to have a vote under those circumstances.

Mr. PRESSLER. Senator SHELBY was not recognized today, deliberately, and he had an amendment regarding public financing ready to go on which we wanted to vote. The majority leader is reluctant to have the Senate vote on the public financing issue. Can we get a vote on that issue tonight? May I ask the majority leader can we get a vote yet tonight?

Mr. MITCHELL. The answer is no. I reject the Senator's characterization of my attitude and my motive; I reject it. It is incorrect, and I have already talked to Senator SHELBY about his amendment.

I have offered repeatedly to let any amendment come up if we could get a time certain for a vote on final passage. I have been told there will be no time certain on final passage, no matter how long we go, no matter which amendments are offered.

If I am wrong in characterizing that as a filibuster, then I think it is something new in the Senate annals. I will be pleased to discuss it here.

The Republican leader said he wants to take time to consider the proposal I have just made. I respect that, and that is a reasonable request. We will wait to see what his consideration yields.

I repeat my request. What we want is a vote on final passage on this bill on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday; can we have an agreement on that? We will vote on Senator SHELBY's amendment, I assure you.

Mr. PRESSLER. It is well known among the back benchers here that the majority leader and leadership on that side of the aisle do not want to vote on

the Shelby amendment and will not allow a vote, and they will—

Mr. MITCHELL. I now offer to make a unanimous-consent request that if the Republican Senators will permit us to have vote on final passage, we will vote on Senator SHELBY's amendment immediately.

Mr. PRESSLER. Why do we not vote without an agreement?

Mr. MITCHELL. Let us get an agreement on final passage.

Mr. PRESSLER. Why should we have to? We are in the process of legislating here.

Mr. MITCHELL. On the very point we are discussing, I made the offer repeatedly. What the Senator wants is to be able to offer an unlimited number of amendments, including Senator SHELBY's, without ever agreeing to permit a final passage on the bill, and that is filibuster by amendment.

I have said I am prepared to accept an agreement under which we will vote on whatever amendment any Senator wants to offer provided it includes a vote on final passage on the bill.

Mr. PRESSLER. The public financing amendment is one amendment on which you will not allow a vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is an amendment on which we will absolutely insist on vote if we can get an agreement to vote on final passage on this bill.

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I have a statement here on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Before I do so, Mr. President, I have only been here, I say to the majority leader, 17 short years, and I daresay participated in the sense of having a vote and have been around at least 50 filibusters. Indeed, this is a filibuster. It talks like one, quacks like one, and it is one. Everybody knows that. We can pretend all we want. I have been in the minority where I tried to drag things out through amendments and not being accused of filibustering, but there is no question about this. The American public knows it.

The majority leader offered any time—any time—for a vote. Offer all the amendments you want. We have been through all of these amendments, and they can kid all they want, but a lot of people do not want this bill, and they do not want to be pegged by the American public as creating gridlock, those who do not want reform. They know the American public does not like that. That is the short end, the wrong end on campaign reform.

What are they doing? Offering amendments, and they want to put up a nice smoke screen and say: Mr. Majority Leader, you will not let us vote on this amendment.

I do not know how many we voted on—over a dozen—and the minority offered every amendment they could offer, and where are we? We are stuck. Two weeks and we cannot pass what I consider now a minimal campaign reform because it has been watered down so much—it is still better than nothing—and we cannot even vote on a

minimal campaign reform bill when the majority is for it with 53 votes.

Mr. President, I do not think anybody is fooling the American public. There is a group of Senators—and they have the right, and I respect that—who do not want campaign reform, and they do not want to come up and say so. Now that we cannot get cloture, they are putting up the smoke screen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DECONCINI pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 116 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. DECONCINI. I yield the floor and thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, what is the situation with the floor? Is it morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I will go forward without changing the pattern of legislative flow.

Let me just say that I have listened with great interest to the debate, and I thought the remarks of my friend from Maine were so succinct, so appropriate, as is his wont. And then my friend from Arizona has been here as I have watched the noble art of filibuster. It is an interesting procedure that protects a minority. It will never change. It is important that it not change.

But may I just suggest that we be absolutely candid and honest with the American people about what is going on here with this legislation?

The American people do not want to pay for our elections. It is called taxpayer financing, public financing, of congressional races. They do not want that. And if we vote on it, they will not get that.

They do not want soft money. They do not want political action committees. They know the absolute influence of political action committees. And, of course, now on the other end of this building, PAC's are mother's milk. And all you do when you reside on that end of the building and you are in the majority, I think some of them perhaps have a separate staff person to simply check the box of whoever might be at the door, saying: You will remember this person; they maxed out on your first primary. They maxed out in your general. They maxed with you for 10 years, or 8, or whatever. And they stockpiled their money over there to drive off any challengers.

That is the way it works.

I think it is appropriate to look at the Washington Post of this morning, June 10. Right at the top of the page, it says: "Democrate Court PAC's They Criticize. Dinner Donors Still Get High-Level Access."

What hypocrisy. What absolute hypocrisy.

And then, of course, there are those who just hate PAC's. They will go to a corporation and get the list of the employees who have contributed to PAC's, and they will say publicly, "I do not take PAC money." Then there will be great violin music in the background, and hosannas and drums and cries of great allegiance.

What they do is they pick up the list of those who contributed to the political action committee. They contact those people individually. They say: "Don't give your \$50 to the PAC anymore. Here I am. I do not take PAC money. I will take yours."

What hypocrisy.

Then let us look just swiftly at what has happened with regard to time on this bill. Today we had an exercise which was solely contrived to prevent a vote on the Shelby amendment—totally contrived. We did nothing this afternoon because the heat was on and we were getting close to an amendment that very few on that side of the aisle want to be involved in.

But we had 17 Democratic amendments and 16 Republican amendments. The Democrats have used the sum or the time of 18 hours. The Republicans have used 13 hours. What is the delay about that?

In fact, the first 2 days of the debate, or at least in the early part of the debate, the Democrat amendments were coming before us one after another. Now we have ours. They have had 17. We have had 16. They have had 18 hours. We have had 13 hours. And we are going to keep presenting amendments.

But let me tell you what is happening. Go look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you will find that many on this side of the aisle are taking a powder on some of these votes. They do not want to go home and talk about this stuff. Go look at the votes: 46-44. Where were 10 of the Members in the middle of the week? Here is one, 47-44. Where were nine Members in the middle of the week? This is when we do our business. Here is one, 32-60. Where were eight Members, there? Here is one, 26-53. And we are here to do the Nation's business. Here is one, 47-45.

Why are many on that side of the aisle just choosing to hide out somewhere in this cavernous building? The reason is quite obvious: They do not dare go back to the American public with this bill the way it will come out of this Senate.

They are terrified. And the biggest part of it is when the people of America find out the Democrats believe you should continue to have political action committees and play this game of sophisticated yo-yo, or we will kill it here and then they will erect it over there.

And there is a fine group of our people who will not allow this bill to go forward if it is different in the House and different in the Senate. How stupid

and absurd it would be to do a campaign finance reform bill and find it is totally different or significantly different in the House than it is in the Senate. That is absolute hypocrisy.

I just wanted to call attention to these issues. Maybe we will have to file a cloture motion to get a vote on the Shelby amendment, the Shelby-Dole or Shelby-McConnell, whatever that may be. We respect those who are involved in that amendment because they are right at the heart, right at the gut, of this bill.

So if we are looking at a filibuster by amendment, you had that this afternoon.

So perhaps as we file this flurry of cloture motions, we will file one on the Shelby-McConnell amendment and see where that one goes. I think we all know where it would go. Unless, of course, there is a tremendous exercise which will be accompanied by crashing limbs, arms jerked from their sockets, popping necks, and a great exercise of seeing who will fall in line as soon as possible after that particular exercise.

So we are ready to go on the important amendments. We think we are entitled to have those, and we will have those because the rules of the Senate will allow us to have those.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. COHEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, if I could just follow up for a few moments on the subject raised by me and others and just addressed by my colleague from Wyoming.

I might say to the Chair and to Members who are remaining, though few, that I can live with virtually any bill that is passed on campaign finance reform. Whatever is passed by this Chamber or the other Chamber I do not believe will affect my future in the State of Maine one way or the other. I feel reasonably confident that the people that I have represented over the past 20 years know me as well as they are going to know me, and will either approve of what I do or disapprove. Nothing that we do here is going to change that.

So if I were only going to act out of my own self-interest, I would simply say, "Pass whatever bill it is you want. It does not matter to me. It will have no impact."

I will run the next time when I am up again in 1996 and this bill will have marginal, if any, impact. The limits will be high enough. It will not be any less than what I have been able to raise in the past. The ban on PAC's will make no difference because it will ultimately be individual contributions instead of political action committees. So I can live with whatever is passed.

I do have a concern, however, in terms of what impact this may have on future challengers in other States. My

my colleagues to indicate, unless those nine elements were involved, that I would not be willing to support this kind of reform effort under any circumstances. And I would repeat that here again today.

There is some danger in saying that. If in fact you lay down the gauntlet and say we will not accept any provision which is inconsistent with what we have agreed in this body, then you, by the very nature of that, have invited them to do that because there are many Members in the House who do not want a campaign finance reform that really goes to the heart of the system. So they will add provisions which they know will not be acceptable by this body and therefore the bill will die.

So I repeat, Mr. President, that I am again prepared to work with my friend from Oklahoma. Several of us on this side of the aisle, maybe more than just several, are willing to try to find an acceptable compromise that will achieve the mutual goals we seek. But I do not wish to see these efforts undermined by the characterization that somehow they are designed in any way to delay this bill unnecessarily.

I think 2 weeks is not a long time to debate this. I think 3 weeks is not even a long time to debate it. I do not think there is any magical time limit we can place on this.

What I do think is important is that we listen to the amendments. We will know intuitively whether or not they are frivolous, whether they are simply designed to stall. If that is the case I think the majority leader would be right in bringing that to the attention of the American people and condemning it. That is his privilege, to do so. But I do not think there have been many frivolous amendments offered.

As I listened to the calculation of who has offered the most amendments, it seems to me the Democratic majority has offered more than the Republicans. The Democratic majority has had more time to debate than the Republicans. So I think as we proceed we ought to proceed in an even-handed fashion and I think we do have some constructive amendments to offer.

I cannot speak for my colleagues as to whether or not there should be a time limitation, a date and a time certain for a final vote. I do not know what their amendments might be. They might have some very positive, constructive amendments to offer. So we should take the time to try to determine that over the weekend, perhaps by Monday or Tuesday.

But I just hope the rhetoric will not soar to such heights that once again this side of the aisle will be condemned for its negativism, its obstructionism, its willingness to engage in hit-and-run activities, ambush legislation, delay it, do anything we can to kill it.

That is not the spirit in which I proceed on this issue. I hope we can make some progress over the weekend and into the following week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maine. I apologize to him but I did not hear the beginning of his remarks. I heard just the last few things he said.

Let me assure him, No. 1, that as manager of the bill I appreciate his input in particular. He has been a part of our negotiations. We have been discussing various amendments. He has been on the floor debating some of the amendments that indeed have been accepted and supported on this side of the aisle, as has Senator JEFFORDS, Senator CHAFES—who I remember offered one of those amendments that was accepted on this side of the aisle that went to one of the points, I believe, in the letter that was sent to us. Senator MCCAIN and Senator DURENBERGER, among others, have been very, very constructive in their suggestions. The letter which they sent to us was constructive. It included very serious points, very worthy of consideration. And I want to assure my colleague from Maine that is the spirit in which those suggestions have been received.

We have worked through some of the amendments, we will continue to work through others. I talked to Senator JEFFORDS today about his disclosure of independent expenditures and advance notice on some of those expenditures. We are trying to work out that amendment. We have made progress on at least one of these three amendments. I think it is virtually in shape to be accepted. We were not able to get to it today but, as I indicated to him, it was one at least we were able to accept and the other two, we are going to see if we cannot work them into such shape that we can.

I just want to explain that the frustrations experienced by the majority leader—and I think all of us watch the burdens on our leaders on both sides in this institution—are extreme; trying to get the business of the Senate done and accommodate the schedules of 100 people and all of the other considerations are very, very difficult. We all know that hopefully, at least, the budget reconciliation bill will soon be ready to come to the floor, a very major decision for the country; the supplemental appropriations bill, as I understand it, is now ready to come to the floor. It has been completed on a bipartisan basis, I might say, happily, by the Appropriations Committee.

So there are many things pressing upon the leadership in terms of the schedule. I had suggested to the distinguished Republican leader on this bill, the Senator from Kentucky, that we try to get a list of amendments on both sides. We put out a hotline that we request the list of all the amendments. Then we could sit down and do exactly what the Senator from Maine said, and that is see how many there are, see the nature and complexity of them, try to determine what a fair amount of time

would be so we could really have a fair discussion of them. Maybe there are 10 amendments and maybe it would take 2 days of debate to debate them; maybe there are 20 and maybe that will take 4 days. But once we got that list we could determine that.

As the majority leader said today, he simply feels the need to get a time certain, that we aim toward final passage, and a agreement that the majority, whatever the majority is, will vote on some of these amendments. And that could well determine the outcome of the bill in terms of whether it would pass or not. But that the majority would be able to work its will when we are through with the amendment process, whatever the majority is at that time. It could be some amendments might be accepted that would shift the outcome of this bill. We do not know. We do not know the outcome of these amendments. But so far we have been frustrated in the attempt to either get a solid endeavor to get a list of the amendments on the other side of the aisle and then some time certain by which we could debate them.

So I want to repeat to my colleague from Maine, I have discussed this again with the majority leader. He extended his offer—he assures me it is a very serious offer—to the minority leader tonight, to say if the minority leader would take under advisement his request that we set some time certain for final passage, that he will accommodate every single amendment that people desire to offer and will accommodate sufficient time for every single one of those amendments to be seriously considered, debated, and voted upon. And that time for final passage would be set on a date that would accommodate that kind of schedule.

So that includes all amendments. I was asked, would we allow, under that scenario, a vote on Senator SHELBY's amendment? Absolutely. It would mean not only that amendment but every amendment would have an opportunity to be considered and voted upon; then we could set a time for final passage.

In the meantime, again I just want to say to my colleague from Maine, we all operate under a great deal of pressure here.

But I want to assure him that nothing that has been said should in any way be interpreted by him as anything less than appreciation on the part of the managers. I know the majority leader upstairs just a moment ago indicated again his appreciation, not only to the Senator from Maine but from other colleagues that I mentioned just a moment ago, for their efforts that we deem are highly sincere and constructive and already, as a result of their amendments, the bill has been improved. We want to continue that process.

Mr. COHEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOREN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. COHEN. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for his comments, and let

me say with respect to the majority leader, he does have an inordinate amount of patience. Frankly, I think he has too much patience. I would not be nearly as generous in the allocation of time to accommodate the various demands of Senators. My own belief is that we should be here during the week. If for some reason we have a commitment like one of our colleagues who wanted to watch his daughter graduate from Harvard University this week, altogether appropriate, that is one of those times you just go to Harvard and take your chances, as he did because he wanted to be there to witness a special occasion.

Each of us is, from time to time, confronted with those kinds of demands upon our time. Frankly, I think that the leadership, both on our side and yours, and particularly on yours, has been more than generous in accommodating those conflicting schedules so that Members will not miss votes. I realize that his patience does, in fact, have some limits. As I indicated before, they are quite inordinate in terms of what he is able to endure and I know the level of frustration he has to suffer.

I am certain that I would not be able to endure nearly as much as he does. Therefore, I am delighted he is, at least for the period of 1993 through 1994, the majority leader. We hope to have him become the minority leader in the next session. But nonetheless, I think he does an outstanding job in trying to take into account the various demands that we place upon him. My own feeling is we should be placing far fewer demands and we should be spending a far greater amount of time legislating. That is something only we can resolve.

So I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, as always, I thank my colleague from Maine. It is always a privilege to work with him. Let me say that all of us interested in this bill, in seeing ultimate action on this bill, including action on all the amendments as well as final passage, will encourage the leaders on both sides to do so.

I hope that the majority leader, having offered a proposal that all amendments be considered, that he will be willing to spend the time on the floor as long as he knows there is light at the end of the tunnel—I can understand his feeling about that—is willing to accommodate and take up all these amendments. I hope, on the other hand, we can encourage the minority leader to work toward getting a list of all the amendments and setting some reasonable time at the end of which we will come to a close and vote.

I think that is the best way to dispose of doing this. It is the constructive way. It protects the rights of all. Everyone has a chance to have input, improve the bill and act upon it. I just

hope we can be successful in that endeavor.

Hopefully, by the time we will be talking again, I am sure on Monday informally, those of us who are here, and hopefully by the time we come back into session on Tuesday, we will be able to perhaps report progress not only on that agreement but perhaps on some of the other substantive matters we are discussing.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, a few moments ago my counterpart on the Republican side, the Republican whip, as he does on occasion—and I enjoy him—gets a little carried away.

He asked some questions without giving any answers to them. I want to give a few answers to the questions my Republican friend asked.

He talked about the number of votes and said: "Why are many on that side of the aisle"—meaning Democrats—"just choosing to hide out somewhere in these cavernous buildings? The reason is quite obvious. They do not dare go back to the American public with this bill the way it will come out of the Senate."

We are willing to vote, and we will vote if they will give us an opportunity.

He said on one vote it was 46 to 44. Where were the 10 Members in the middle of the week? It happened to be five Republicans were absent and five Democrats. So it was an equal division. There were five Republicans missing on that particular vote.

Here is one, he said, 47 to 44. Where were nine Members in the middle of the week? Of the nine Members, six of them were Republicans and three were Democrats. One was in the hospital with a heart problem and the other was home because of a death in the family. Where were the Republicans? Where were they hiding on these amendments? And this is when our business is done.

He said, Here is one, 32 to 60. Where were eight Members there? There were five Republicans missing and only three Democrats, and we know where two of them were.

Here is one he says was 26 to 53. He talks about the middle of the week. There were 12 Democrats and 9 Republicans missing then, but that was on Friday, not in the middle of the week. You ought to get the record straight, instead of accusing us of being gone, you have more Republicans gone. Instead of saying it is in the middle of

the week, the vote he gives us is on Friday.

Then he said, Here is one, 47 to 45. True, four Democrats were missing, but also four Republicans were missing. When you add them up, there were more Republicans missing than there were Democrats in those votes that he questioned the Senate about.

And why are many on that side of the aisle—let me turn around and ask him a question—why were there so many on his side of the aisle—his side of the aisle—who were not here to cast their votes? He acts like it was all Democrats and no Republicans. When you figure it up, it was more Republicans than Democrats. You ought to get your figures right. You ought to make statements correctly and the record ought to be corrected. I hope that when we develop this, the people will understand.

Where we had six Republicans and three Democrats—I think I said this earlier—we had one who was absent because of a death in the family and the other Member was in the hospital. So you could not very well expect either one of those Democrats to be here. So we only had one really missing and six Republicans.

Who is hiding out? Who is in the cavernous building? Who does not want to vote on this bill? Who will not give us a time certain? Offered them every amendment they want to offer. Ask one thing: Final vote on final passage.

Now, I say to my counterpart on the Republican side, he has had his say, and I have had mine. Let us go back to the drawing board. Let us get the amendments. Let us look at them, see how much time it will take to debate those and set a time certain for final passage.

That is not a hard thing to do. But when you ask them yesterday about today, no. Can we vote tomorrow? No. Can we vote Monday? No. Can we vote Tuesday? No. The majority leader even a few moments ago said, well, what about Wednesday of next week? What about Thursday of next week? No answer.

I understand the Republican leader is taking the proposal under advisement, and I hope he looks at it very seriously because right now we are being prevented from going to final passage on this bill, this money-chase bill that so many people would like to see passed and those on the other side, in my opinion, are obstructing.

I think the distinguished Senator from Maine made some nice remarks a few moments ago, constructive remarks. So maybe by next Monday they will have their amendments all lined up and we can put those in a package and get a time certain for a vote on final passage of this piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I hope that somewhere between now and Monday afternoon we will find the ability to come together and vote on all amendments proposed and then go to final passage.